

VZCZCXRO4337  
PP RUEHAST  
DE RUEHBW #1113/01 1911525  
ZNR UUUUU ZZH  
P 101525Z JUL 06  
FM AMEMBASSY BELGRADE  
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8988  
INFO RUEHZL/EUROPEAN POLITICAL COLLECTIVE  
RHEHNSC/NSC WASHDC 1157  
RUFOADA/JAC MOLESWORTH RAF MOLESWORTH UK  
RHMFISS/CDR USEUCOM VAIHINGEN GE  
RXFEAA/HQ AFSOUTH NAPLES IT

UNCLAS SECTION 01 OF 03 BELGRADE 001113

SIPDIS

SIPDIS

E.O. 12958: N/A  
TAGS: [OVIP](#) [PREL](#) [PGOV](#) [YI](#) [SR](#)  
SUBJECT: KOSOVO: FM DRASKOVIC LETTER TO THE SECRETARY AND CONTACT  
GROUP COUNTRIES

BELGRADE 00001113 001.2 OF 003

11. (U) On July 6, the Embassy received a letter from Foreign Minister Vuk Draskovic to the Secretary and the Contact Group Foreign Ministers outlining redlines and urging a compromise solution for Kosovo's final status.

12. (U) Begin text of letter:  
REPUBLIC OF SERBIA  
MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Belgrade, 7 July 2006

Excellency,  
Dear Condoleezza,

The Contact Group has been entrusted with an exceptionally important task of formulating a proposal solution for the future status of Kosovo and Metohija, the province of Serbia administered since 10 June 1999 by the United Nations under Security Council Resolution 1244.

There are indications that the talks and negotiations on the new status of Kosovo, conducted by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Martti Ahtisaari, are

SIPDIS  
entering the concluding phase.

Announcements, even undisguised positions to the effect that the independence of Kosovo is inevitable are rife. In other words [sic], that it is inevitable to treat the internationally sovereign state of Serbia as a no man's land, the internationally recognized borders of which may be changed against its will. Such plans are evinced also by the fact that some of the guiding principles of the Contact Group, adopted by the Security Council, are most often construed as if these principles were null and void.

I shall recall some of the guiding principles of the Contact Group for the determination of the future status of Kosovo.

No return to the situation prior to March 1999. This means, it is said, that there is no return of the military, police and government authorities of Serbia to Kosovo. All right. But, this must mean that there is no change of the status of the state borders of Serbia with the Republic of Albania and the Republic of Macedonia, either, since the present status of these borders is no the result of the situation prior to March 1999, i.e. before the NATO bombing of Serbia; rather, it is the result of the situation emerged after the cessation of the bombing, the situation confirmed also by the peace agreement between NATO and Serbia (The Kumanovo Agreement) and the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244 of 10 June 1999 in

order to shift its internationally recognized borders, but to stop and prevent the humanitarian catastrophe of the Albanian majority in Kosovo, as was also officially explained.

No partition of Kosovo. This means and can only mean that there is no division of the state of Serbia, either, and, by extension, no international independence of Kosovo since the independence would amount to the division and break-up of the internationally sovereign state of Serbia. The explanations that it is not possible to break up and divide the territory of a province that is not a state, but that it is possible to break up and divide the territory of a state, the part of which the province is, runs afoul not only of the Charter of the United Nations and international law, but also of the very logic of thinking.

No imposed solution. This means and must mean that sustainable and legitimate is, primarily, the solution that is accepted by both sides and that, in the event such agreement proves impossible to reach, the Contact Group and the United Nations Security Council should step in as an honest broker that will respect in equal measure the legitimate rights of the Albanian majority in the Province of Kosovo, the legitimate rights of the Serbs and other non-Albanians in Kosovo, as well as the legitimate rights of the state of Serbia.

As I have already pointed out, "preventing the humanitarian catastrophe of the Albanians" in Kosovo was presented as a pretext [sic] for NATO bombing of Serbia, from 24 March to early June 1999.

The demands of the state of Serbia to prevent a similar humanitarian disaster of Kosovo Serbs which has been going on ever since 10 June 1999 when the UN protectorate of Kosovo was introduced, have unfortunately been treated as an outcry for help in the desert.

And not only have these demands of Serbia been ignored, but the Albanian majority has been practically encouraged to carry out the ethnic cleansing and do mass crimes both against the Serbs and against their churches, monasteries, historical and cultural

BELGRADE 00001113 002.2 OF 003

heritage. Here is the proof. Since 10 June 1999, 220,000 Kosovo Serbs and other non-Albanians have been driven out, more than 1,000 civilians (including many children) have been killed or kidnapped and nearly 40,000 Serbian houses and 150 centuries-old churches and monasteries have been burned down. Serbs have also been dispossessed of thousands of dwellings, their land and businesses. And what has been the response of the competent authorities of the United Nations and the international community? Heads of UNMIK, military commanders have been replaced and principles changed. The original principle "standards before status" was replaced by that of both "standards and status," and now "status as a precondition of standards" has been rushed to promote.

Albanian leaders have also been congratulated for their promise to respect the rights of Serbs with an ultimatum-like precondition that Kosovo become fully independent before the end of this year. At the same time, Albanian threats of rebellion along with reprisals against Serbs and international forces have been advanced as the reason for accepting such an ultimatum in case independence is not agreed!

In my opinion, the Contact Group should not fail to respond to these ultimatums and blackmail.

An independent Kosovo would be a reward for the crimes committed against Serbs that are, by its nature and intent, identical to the crimes committed prior to June 1999 against the Albanians, which was why Serbia was bombed.

By adhering to the guiding principles of the Contact Group, Serbia is fully committed to a compromise solution. However, there are two demands that we as a state and a nation cannot go below:

11. The rights of Serbs and of other non-Albanians of Kosovo must be protected unconditionally and with international guarantees

provided; and

12. The internationally recognized borders of the international sovereign state of Serbia cannot be changed.

Which of these two demands are we not entitled to?

More than autonomy, but less than full independence for Kosovo. What does this compromise formula mean?

It means that all legitimate demands of the Albanian majority in Kosovo will be met, that the rights of Serbs and other non-Albanians will be unconditionally protected and that the Charter of the United Nations will be respected.

The Serbian people, both in Serbia itself and in all places outside it, would not only refuse to recognize an independent state being declared in the territory of the Serbian state but would receive such a decision with resentment. This would lead to permanent instability in the Balkan region and in a number of other regions in Europe and the world at large. All the separatists the world over are waiting to see whether the Kosovo knot will be unraveled in accordance with the UN Charter and the relevant international law or according to the diktat of the mighty and powerful and by blackmail.

Compromise is also in the best interest of the Albanian people in Kosovo, who cannot build either their present or future on hostility to Serbs. This is bound to happen should another state of the Albanians in the Balkans be declared forcibly in the territory of Serbia, i.e. in the territory which is historically in the birthplace of both the Serbian state and Serbian Christian faith.

Compromise is also in the interest of all neighbouring countries, their stability and common European future.

That is why compromise must also be the overriding interest of the Contact Group, United Nations Security Council, European Union and the entire international community.

Best regards,

/s/  
Vuk Drakovic

A copy of this letter was also sent to:

-H. E. Mr. Sergey Viktorovich Lavrov, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation

-Rt. Hon. Margaret Beckett MP, Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and

BELGRADE 00001113 003.2 OF 003

Northern Ireland

-H. E. Mr. Frank-Walter Steinmeier, Federal Foreign Minister of the Federal Republic of Germany

-H. E. Mr. Pihlippe Douste-Blazy, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the French Republic

-H. E. Mr. Massimo D'Alema, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Italy

End text of letter.

POLT